

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 98-6427**

---

GEORGE H. VAN WAGNER, III,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

PHILIP CORSO; ROBERT J. ROMITO; PAUL T. DEBRUYN,

Plaintiffs,

versus

DENNIS R. BIDWELL; MARIE GRAHAM, Director of Health Services; SANDRA HOWARD, M.D.; A. VICTORIA; M. RONGO, all in their individual and official capacities; MARGARET HAMBRICK, Regional Director; HAROLD A. ROSE, Compliance Analyst; BARBARA K. VONA, Chief of Compliance, all in their individual and official capacities; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS; OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT; KENNETH R. MORITSVGU, MD, BOP Health Services Director; QUINCY T. HECK, BOP Regional Health Systems Administrator; GEORGE C. WIGEN, Warden, FCI Schuylikill; DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (CA-96-4070-CCB, CA-97-1963-CCB, CA-97-2465-CCB, CA-97-1616-CCB)

---

---

Submitted: January 12, 1999

Decided: January 29, 1999

---

Before NIEMEYER and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

George H. Van Wagner, III, Appellant Pro Se. Lynne Ann Battaglia, United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland; J. Joseph Currah, Jr., Attorney General, Wendy Ann Kronmiller, Assistant Attorney General, Thomas Walton Keech, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland; Earle Bronson Wilson, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C.; Scott Sutherland Harris, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Washington, D.C., for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

George Van Wagner, III, appeals the district court's order denying relief in this consolidated action under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), and denying relief on his petition under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2241 (West 1994 & Supp. 1998). We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Van Wagner v. Bidwell, Nos. CA-96-4070-CCB; CA-97-1963-CCB; CA-97-2465-CCB; CA-97-1616-CCB (D. Md. Jan. 30, 1998).<sup>\*</sup> We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

---

<sup>\*</sup> Although the district court's order is marked as "filed" on January 28, 1998, the district court's records show it was entered on the docket sheet on January 30, 1998. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 and 79(a), we consider this date as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).